



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

contact at all with Jesus, it must be in this way" (119). Thus, it would seem, the author does not believe that Paul had a vision of the risen Lord, for he says that his contact with Jesus is identical with that which men may have today; but men today, do not claim to have visions of him. And how is Paul the "*great witness*" for the risen Christ, if every true disciple has an experience identical with his? If we have "first-hand" contact with the risen Christ, nothing can be of higher authority.

But again, if our contact with Jesus *must* be identical with Paul's, what is to be said of the multitudes of Christians who, unlike Paul, have never been conscious enemies of Jesus, and of others, many in number, who, like Augustine and Bunyan, come into the kingdom not by means of any kind of "contact" with the heavenly Jesus, but simply by some word of Scripture that comes home to them with power, or by "contact" with an earthly friend?

No, we have our reasons for believing that Jesus lives, but they are just as certainly different from Paul's reason, if we judge of that by the New Testament, as they are from the reasons which the original apostles seem to have had.

Dr. Gordon's book leaves the historical problem of the resurrection of Jesus just where it was. The solution of that problem can be furthered only by more comprehensive and accurate study of the sources than has hitherto been made. Yet this book, as a whole, in spite of what seem to be serious defects, not only illustrates but also to some extent reinforces the strong tide in the Protestant church that is setting away from reliance on the miraculous to which, as Matthew Arnold said, the human mind is strongly and persistently inclined.

GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

NOTES ON LUTHER'S LETTERS

This edition of the letters,¹ by far the best, was undertaken by Dr. Enders as the last part of the Erlangen edition of the complete works, and continued by him until his death on July 14, 1906. The eleventh volume was published in 1907, by Dr. G. Kawerau, who is planning to complete the work and who kindly informs me that he has the twelfth volume nearly ready.

Two general criticisms must be offered on this edition. First, that the

¹ *Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel*. By E. L. Enders. Letters in the edition of Enders, to August '31, 1538. 11 volumes. 1884-1907. Frankfurt-am-Main: Calw & Stuttgart.

division of the works into Latin and German, adopted by the Erlangen editors, has been carried into the publication of the letters. Most of the German letters having already been published in Vols. LIII–LVI of the edition, are therefore not reprinted in Enders, but only calendared and annotated, making it necessary to refer for the text to these volumes or to De Wette, from whose edition they were bodily taken. Secondly, there are numerous minor errors in the printing of the text, as noted by Kawerau in his article “Fünfundzwanzig Jahre Lutherforschung” in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Heft 3 (1908). The same has been noted by the present writer who has compared several letters as printed in Enders with photographs of the originals, now on sale at the Berlin Library and elsewhere. As these corrections, though numerous, are slight, they will not be further noticed in this article.

Enders' edition of the letters must be supplemented by the two following collections: Dr. Franz Gundlach: *Nachträge zum Briefwechsel des Landgrafen Philip mit Luther und Melanchthon*. In *Festschrift zum Gedächtnis Philipps des Grossmütigen Landgrafen von Hessen*. Kassel, 1904; Dr. K. A. H. Burkhardt: *Zum ungedruckten Briefwechsel der Reformatoren, besonders Luthers*. In *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*. No. 14, Leipzig. March 21, 1907.

Besides these general criticisms, there are a few particular corrections of such importance that they deserve special mention:

A. Vol. I, p. 2, n. 3: The “Conradum affinem” is not, as here stated, a Conrad Luther, but a relative of the Reformer's mother, a certain Conrad Hutter. Cf. O. Clemen, *Magdeburgische Blätter*. Heft 1 (1904–5), pp. 1–3.

B. The letter to Pope Leo X, dated March 3, 1519, Vol. I, p. 442, is really only the draft of a letter which was submitted to Miltitz at the conference of January 5–7, 1519, but never sent. The date is therefore wrong, and the nature of the document should be stated, as otherwise it may be treated as a real missive. Cf. Köstlin-Kawerau, *Martin Luther* (Berlin, 1903), Vol. I, p. 224, and Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste*, Vol. IV (1907), Part I, chap. vii.

C. Vol. III, pp. 122 f., Letter to Cuspinian, April 17, 1521. This important letter, written “in the same hour” in which Luther made his first appearance before the Diet of Worms, was first published in Gleichen, *Annales ecclesiae* (1730), and from this book taken into De Wette and thence into Enders. As printed here it is nonsense, such expressions as “coram Caesare et fratre Romano constiti” making Ferdinand king of the Romans ten years before he was elected to that office. The editors of Luther's complete works recently published at St. Louis, Mo. (a reprint of Walch's

complete edition of a hundred and fifty years ago with modern improvements) rightly took offense at this expression. T. M. Lindsay, in his *History of the Reformation*, Vol. I (1907), p. 283, quotes the letter, incorrect as it is. A facsimile of the original, in the Vienna Archives was published by Dr. Theodore Haase, in the *Leipziger Illustrirte Zeitung* of August 31, 1889. As this seems to be so little known even by scholars, it may be pardonable to give the correct text from the facsimile, with the assurance that this is certainly trustworthy, being in Luther's true hand:

Viro celeberrimo eruditissimoque, dno. Cuspiniano, Caesareae Majestatis a Libris Viennae, suo in Domino &c.

Salutem. Frater carnis tuae, Cuspiniane celeberrime, facile mihi persuasit, ut e medio isto tumultu ad te auderem scribere, cum antea ob nominis tui celebritatem optarim tibi familiariter notus esse. Suscipe ergo me in tuorum album, ut vera esse comprobem, que frater tuus mihi de te tam pleno ore cantavit. Hac hora coram Caesare et Senatu Romano constiti interrogatus, an libros meos revocare velim. Ubi respondi, libros quidem esse meos, caeterum quid de revocatione sentiam, cras dicturum, petita et data mihi non amplius spatii et temporis ad deliberandum parte. Verum ego ne apicem quidem revocabo in aeternum, Christo quidem propitio. Vale mi Cuspiniane charissime. Wormatiae, f. 4. p. Quasimodogeniti 1521.

Enders was unable to identify Cuspinian's brother. Haase makes him a cousin, a certain George Cuspinian, a canon of Würzburg, who had gone to Worms with his bishop. The one thing that makes me doubtful of this identification is that a cousin is not a brother. As Luther often uses "caro" in the sense of wife, it is possible that "frater carnis tuae" might mean brother-in-law, though it might also mean nothing more than own brother. No trace of such a brother is to be found in Cuspinian's diary (*Fontes Rerum Austriacarum*, I. *Scriptores*, T. 1).

D. Vol. X, pp. 137 f., Letter to Müller, March 18, 1535. This not very important missive has attained a great degree of notoriety on account of the unsteady hand with which it was written and the consequent variety of readings that have been extracted from it, and especially from the last word. The Catholic Evers found this document in the Vatican archive and published it as a supplement to his life of Luther (1880) reading the signature as "Dr. Plenus," or "Dr. Full," a welcome evidence of the Reformer's intoxication at the time he indited it. This reading was adopted by Enders, *loc. cit.*, and by Denifle, *Luther und Lutherthum*, Vol. I. (Mainz, 1904), p. 133, n. 4. Kroker, *Katharina von Bora* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 278, reads "Dr. Hans," referring it to Luther's son. Kawerau, *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* (Jahrgang, 1908), Heft 4, p. 603, reads "Dr. Plures"

though he can give it no sense. K. Löffler, *Historische Jahrbücher*, Vol. XXX (1909), Heft 1, reads "Dr. Parvus," referring it to Luther's son. Böhmer, *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung* (1906), p. 158, reads "Dr. Johannes," also referring it to Luther's son. I have myself seen excellent photographs of the original, but hardly venture to give an opinion when so many experts disagree. Perhaps "Dr. Plenus" (written *plenus*) agrees best with both the writing and the sense of the letter.

E. Vol. X, p. 345, Letter of Luther and others to Philip of Hesse. This is badly printed, for the correct text one must turn to Gundlach, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

LETTERS IN VARIOUS EDITIONS, AFTER AUGUST 31, 1538

For the correspondence of the Reformer, so far as not included in Enders, reference must be had to the following: De Wette, *Luthers Briefe &c.* (Berlin, 1828), Vol. V; De Wette-Seidemann, *Luther's Briefe &c.* (Berlin, 1856), Vol. VI (Supplement); Seidemann, *Lutherbriefe* (Dresden, 1859); Burkhardt, *Dr. Martin Luther's Briefwechsel* (1866); Th. Kolde, *Analecta Lutherana* (Gotha, 1883); M. Lenz, *Briefwechsel des Landgrafen Philipps von Hessen mit Buzer*, Vol. I (1880); M. Lenz, "Nachlese zum Briefwechsel &c.," in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. IV (1881); Gundlach and Burkhardt as above. Other letters are to be found singly in other places. In Mentz, *Johann Friedrich*, Vol. III (Supplement. Jena, 1908), there is one letter to Luther; one from him in Seidemann, *Lauterbachs Tagebuch auf das Jahr 1538* (Dresden, 1872), pp. 196 ff.

These letters are now in such confusion that nothing short of a new and complete edition could bring them into convenient order and correct form. This will be partly done by the continuation of Enders' work, but the student cannot expect to have a really serviceable set of the Reformer's correspondence until it is published in the last volumes of the Weimar edition. The gentlemen who have this work in charge inform me that it will probably be many years before these volumes are out. In the meantime, at least pending the subsequent volumes of Enders, the historian who reads a letter in De Wette is obliged to consult one by one all the numerous supplementary volumes to ascertain whether the readings and notes before him are accurate, as each book makes corrections, sometimes very important ones, on its predecessors. These corrections need not be noticed, but those made elsewhere, especially by the valuable work of W. W. Rockwell, *Die Doppelhehe Philipps von Hessen* (Marburg, 1904), are in a few cases so important as to deserve special attention.

A. The Confessional Counsel (*Beichtrat*) sent by the Wittenberg

theologians to Philip of Hesse, December 10, 1539, De Wette-Seidemann, *op. cit.*, pp. 238 ff. This is generally supposed, as stated here by Seidemann, to have been composed by Melanchthon. Rockwell proves that it was only copied by him, with a few alterations, from a draft sent by Philip of Hesse which had been written for him by his councilor, Justus Winter. It can be readily seen that this fact is of great importance in judging the attitude of the reformers.

B. Luther to the Elector John Frederick, in Seidemann, *Lauterbach's Tagebuch auf das Jahr 1538*, pp. 196 ff. This is set by Seidemann in April or June, 1540, by Kolde early in June, and by Rockwell on June 10. This epistle, the writer's justification for his attitude in the bigamy of Philip, has been often overlooked notwithstanding its great importance. One passage has excited some comment: "Hette ich aber gewust, dass der Lantgraff solche notturft [i. e., his need of women] nhulengsther wol gebüset und bussen konte an andern, als ich nhu erst erfare, an der zu Esschweg, solte mich freilich kein engel zu solchem rath gebracht haben." On this Kawerau (Köstlin-Kawerau, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 477) remarks: "Dagegen ist dunkel, wie er das schreiben könnte . . . denn dass Philip . . . sich 'der Hurerei, Unkeuschheit und Ehebruchs nicht habe erwehren können' stand in der Luther übergebenen Instruction Philipps deutlich geschrieben." Rockwell tries to defend Luther by saying that it is highly probable that Luther means that, had he known that Philip satisfied his desires with other mistresses, as with her of Eschweg, he would have advised him to marry one of them instead of an uncorrupted virgin. It is doubtful how far this explanation, if admitted, exculpates Luther.

C. Luther to the landgrave, July 24, 1542, De Wette-Seidemann, *op. cit.*, p. 275, l. 13. Rockwell supplies the word lacking, probably from the original in Cassel, as "poli."

D. Luther to the landgrave, April 10, 1542. The copy of this letter in De Wette-Seidemann, *op. cit.*, p. 312, is very faulty; for the correct text one must turn to Lenz, *Nachlese &c.*, p. 136.

E. Luther to Friedrich von der Grüne, Burkhardt, *Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel*, p. 403. This is set at the end of 1541 by the editor on the ground that the Weimar archives show that this was the time when Grüne was employed at Wittenberg. Köstlin (Köstlin-Kawerau, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 680, n. to p. 491) thinks that the letter should be dated at the same time as the saying found in Förstemann-Bindseil, *Luthers Tischreden*, Vol. IV (1848), pp. 474 ff. The same saying is found in H. Wrampelmeyer, *Tagebuch über Dr. Martin Luther geführt von Dr. Conrad Cordatus* (Halle, 1885), No. 671, where it is datable in the first quarter of 1532. It is prob-

able that the strong resemblance between the letter and saying do not prove that they were contemporaneous, but rather that the works of which Luther complained lasted a long time. The late date of the letter is made probable also by its great asperity of tone, more characteristic of the Reformer's closing years.

III. AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF LUTHER'S LETTERS

Anyone who knows Luther's letters in the original must agree with Coleridge that it is a little strange that for so long no one undertook to translate them into English. Such a work is now at last before us, *The Letters of Martin Luther*, selected and translated by Margaret A. Currie (London: Macmillan, 1908). The selection and translation are such as to make the appearance of the work a subject of regret rather than congratulation. It would be hard to make a worse choice of five hundred letters out of the nearly six thousand extant. Not only are many of the most important events in the Reformer's life, such as the Leipzig Debate, the Peasants' Revolt, and the bigamy of Philip of Hesse, totally passed over, but many letters are inserted which never should have been included, as for example that letter to Leo X of 1519 above mentioned (Currie, p. 43) and one long ago proved a forgery. This epistle, purporting to be from the Reformer to his sister Dorothy, is inserted not once but twice under different dates (pp. 200 and 376, dated variously 1527 and 1539), although its genuineness was suspected by Seidemann in 1856 and its falsity proved by Burkhardt in 1866 (*Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel*, p. 338).

The errors in translation are too numerous to be pointed out and too bad to be corrected. Three specimens of the translator's scholarship may serve to give a faint idea of its quality.

Eoban Hesse appears throughout as Coban Hesse (pp. xiii, xiv, 243, 347, etc.).

On p. 142 we come across "the Cardinal of Eborack." The reference is to Wolsey, cardinal archbishop of York.

On p. 322, "He invited Bugenhagen and me to breakfast, because the day before I had forbidden the sacrament (*Nachtmahl*) in the bath." The true translation of these words, which appear in Latin in the source from which Miss Currie says she got the letter, though she thinks proper to insert a German word to explain her version, is: "He invited me and Bugenhagen to breakfast after I had declined his invitation to dinner after the bath the previous evening." Cf. Enders, *op. cit.*, Vol. X, p. 267. Köstlin-Kawerau, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 371.

PRESERVED SMITH

PARIS, FRANCE